

This behavior and the fact that the number of digits of $Z_{10}(10^m)$ is m , motivated the study of the asymptotic behavior of $\frac{Z_{10}(10^k)}{10^k}$ in [8], where it was shown (as suggested by the previous examples) that:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Z_{10}(n)}{n} = \frac{1}{4}.$$

Also, in [8] was suggested (and was proved in [3]) that if $b = p_1^{r_1} \cdots p_s^{r_s}$, then:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Z_b(n)}{n} = \min_{1 \leq i \leq s} \frac{1}{r_i(p_i - 1)}.$$

Now, it is natural to wonder about what will be the behavior of the digits of $Z_b(b^k)$ for other values of b . Let us have a look at the case $k = 20$ for various values of b :

$$\begin{aligned} Z_2(2^{20}) &= 1743392200 \\ Z_3(3^{20}) &= 549755813887 \\ Z_4(4^{20}) &= 23841857910156 \\ Z_5(5^{20}) &= 1828079220031481 \\ Z_6(6^{20}) &= 13298711049602000 \\ Z_7(7^{20}) &= 384307168202282325 \\ Z_8(8^{20}) &= 384307168202282325 \\ Z_9(9^{20}) &= 3039416364764232200 \\ Z_{10}(10^{20}) &= 2499999999999999996 \\ Z_{11}(11^{20}) &= 67274999493256000920 \\ Z_{12}(12^{20}) &= 1916879996223737561074 \\ Z_{13}(13^{20}) &= 1583746981240066619900 \\ Z_{14}(14^{20}) &= 13944709237547466926759 \\ Z_{15}(15^{20}) &= 83131418251991271972652 \\ Z_{16}(16^{20}) &= 302231454903657293676543 \\ Z_{17}(17^{20}) &= 254014462915473282650100 \\ Z_{18}(18^{20}) &= 3187059054099019543609340 \\ Z_{19}(19^{20}) &= 2088331858752553232964200 \\ Z_{20}(20^{20}) &= 26214399999999999999999999991 \\ Z_{21}(21^{20}) &= 46369738241158591439532728 \\ Z_{30}(30^{20}) &= 871696100249999999999999999987 \end{aligned}$$

In the light of this data, it may seem that the only interesting behavior takes place at the multiples of 10. Nevertheless, this is not the case, as can be seen having

a look at the base b expansion of the considered number:

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_2(2^{20}) &= \{1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1\}_2 \\
Z_3(3^{20}) &= \{1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1\}_3 \\
Z_4(4^{20}) &= \{1, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3\}_4 \\
Z_5(5^{20}) &= \{1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1\}_5 \\
Z_6(6^{20}) &= \{2, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 4, 5\}_6 \\
Z_7(7^{20}) &= \{1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1\}_7 \\
Z_8(8^{20}) &= \{2, 5, 2, 5, 2, 5, 2, 5, 2, 5, 2, 5, 2, 5, 2, 5, 2, 5\}_8 \\
Z_9(9^{20}) &= \{2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2\}_9 \\
Z_{10}(10^{20}) &= \{2, 4, 9, 9, 9, 9, 9, 9, 9, 9, 9, 9, 9, 9, 9, 9, 9, 6\}_{10} \\
Z_{11}(11^{20}) &= \{1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1\}_{11} \\
Z_{12}(12^{20}) &= \{5, 11, 11, 11, 11, 11, 11, 11, 11, 11, 11, 11, 11, 11, 11, 11, 10, 10\}_{12} \\
Z_{13}(13^{20}) &= \{1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1\}_{13} \\
Z_{14}(14^{20}) &= \{2, 4, 9, 4, 9, 4, 9, 4, 9, 4, 9, 4, 9, 4, 9, 4, 9, 1\}_{14} \\
Z_{15}(15^{20}) &= \{3, 11, 3, 11, 3, 11, 3, 11, 3, 11, 3, 11, 3, 11, 3, 11, 3, 7\}_{15} \\
Z_{16}(16^{20}) &= \{3, 15, 15, 15, 15, 15, 15, 15, 15, 15, 15, 15, 15, 15, 15, 15, 15, 15\}_{16} \\
Z_{17}(17^{20}) &= \{1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1\}_{17} \\
Z_{18}(18^{20}) &= \{4, 8, 17, 17, 17, 17, 17, 17, 17, 17, 17, 17, 17, 17, 17, 17, 17, 14\}_{18} \\
Z_{19}(19^{20}) &= \{1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1\}_{19} \\
Z_{20}(20^{20}) &= \{4, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 19, 11\}_{20} \\
Z_{21}(21^{20}) &= \{3, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 5\}_{21} \\
Z_{22}(22^{20}) &= \{2, 4, 8, 17, 13, 4, 8, 17, 13, 4, 8, 17, 13, 4, 8, 17, 13, 4, 8, 14\}_{22} \\
Z_{23}(23^{20}) &= \{1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1\}_{23} \\
Z_{24}(24^{20}) &= \{7, 23, 23, 23, 23, 23, 23, 23, 23, 23, 23, 23, 23, 23, 23, 23, 23, 18\}_{24} \\
Z_{25}(25^{20}) &= \{3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3\}_{25}
\end{aligned}$$

Of course, the origin of these cyclic repetitions is closely related to the periodic expression of $\vartheta(b) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Z_b(n)}{n}$ when expressed in base b . In this paper we study the relation between $\vartheta(b)$ and the base b expansion of $Z_b(b^k)$. If b is a prime power, we will show the equality between the k digits of $Z_b(b^k)$ and the first k digits in the fractional part of $\vartheta(b)$ (i. e., $\lfloor \vartheta(b)b^k \rfloor$). In the general case this equality does not hold. We are then interested in investigating the number of final digits of $Z_b(b^k)$ which break the previous coincidence. To do so, let us consider $\eta(b, k) := \lfloor \log_b (\lfloor \vartheta(b)b^k \rfloor - Z_b(b^k)) + 1 \rfloor$. This represents the number of digits of the base b expansion of $\lfloor \vartheta(b)b^k \rfloor - Z_b(b^k)$ and observe that the number of unequal final digits between $\lfloor \vartheta(b)b^k \rfloor$ and $Z_b(b^k)$ is at most $\eta(b, k) + 1$. We will show that

$$\eta(b, k) \leq \lfloor \log_b k + 2 \rfloor$$

is the best possible upper bound for $\eta(b, k)$. Nevertheless, we will improve this upper bound in the case when b is square-free and present some conjectures about this bound.

The paper is organized as follows, in the second section we present the basic facts and technical results that will be used in the rest of the paper. In the third section we study the prime-power case, establishing the equality between the k digits of $Z_b(b^k)$ and the first k digits of the base b expansion of $\vartheta(b)$. Finally, in the fourth section, we study the general case, where the latter equality does not hold and give a bound to the number of unequal digits.

2. TECHNICAL RESULTS

In this section we present some technical results which will be very useful in the sequel. Some of them are well-known and are presented without proof. The section is divided into three parts, the first is devoted to results related to $Z_b(b^k)$, the second mostly deals with the base b expansion of $\vartheta(b)$ when b is a prime-power and the third one is devoted to present the main lemma which will be crucial in the paper.

2.1. Some results about $Z_b(n)$. We start this subsection with the following well-known lemma, which was first proved by Legendre (see [4]), that we present without proof.

Lemma 1.

- (1) $Z_p(n) = \sum_{i \geq 1} \left\lfloor \frac{n}{p^i} \right\rfloor = \frac{n - \sigma_p(n)}{p - 1}$, where $\sigma_p(n)$ is the sum of the digits of the base p expansion of n .
- (2) $Z_{p^r}(n) = \left\lfloor \frac{Z_p(n)}{r} \right\rfloor$ for every $r \geq 1$.
- (3) If $b = p_1^{r_1} \cdots p_s^{r_s}$, then $Z_b(n) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq s} Z_{p_i^{r_i}}(n)$.

As a straightforward consequence of the preceding lemma we obtain:

Corollary 1. *Let l be any integer and p be a prime. Then:*

$$Z_p(lp^n) = lZ_p(p^n) + Z_p(l).$$

Recall that $\vartheta(b) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Z_b(n)}{n}$. In [3] and [8] an explicit expression for $\vartheta(b)$ was given. Namely:

Proposition 1. *If $b = p_1^{r_1} \cdots p_s^{r_s}$, then:*

$$\vartheta(b) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq s} \frac{1}{r_i(p_i - 1)}.$$

Remark. The sequence $S_n = \frac{1}{\vartheta(n)}$ appears in *The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences* as sequence A090624. It is interesting to observe that it was included in the Encyclopedia 5 years before the formula for $\vartheta(n)$ was found.

The following lemma will be of great importance in sections 3 and 4.

Lemma 2. *Let $k \geq 0$ be an integer.*

(1) If $b > 1$ is an integer, then:

$$0 < Z_b(b^{k+1}) - bZ_b(b^k).$$

(2) If b is a prime power, then:

$$0 < Z_b(b^{k+1}) - bZ_b(b^k) < b.$$

Proof. (1) First of all observe that $k[x] \leq [kx]$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and that if $x \notin \mathbb{Z}$ and $kx \in \mathbb{Z}$ the inequality is strict. Now, for some prime divisor of b (with exponent r in the decomposition of b) we have that:

$$bZ_b(b^k) = b \left\lfloor \frac{1}{r} \sum_{i \geq 1} \left\lfloor \frac{b^k}{p^i} \right\rfloor \right\rfloor < \left\lfloor \frac{1}{r} \sum_{i \geq 1} \left\lfloor \frac{b^{k+1}}{p^i} \right\rfloor \right\rfloor = Z_b(b^{k+1}),$$

since $\frac{b^k}{p^{r(k+1)}}$ is not an integer, while $b \frac{b^k}{p^{r(k+1)}}$ is.

(2) Put $b = p^n$. Then, Corollary 1 implies that $Z_p(p^{(k+1)n}) = p^n Z_p(p^{kn}) + Z_p(p^n)$.

Now, if r is the remainder of the division between $Z_p(p^{(k+1)n})$ and n and s is the remainder of the division between $Z_p(p^{kn})$ and n it follows that:

$$Z_{p^n}(p^{(k+1)n}) = \frac{Z_p(p^{(k+1)n}) - r}{n},$$

$$Z_{p^n}(p^{kn}) = \frac{Z_p(p^{kn}) - s}{n}.$$

Thus, since $0 \leq r, s \leq n-1$:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{p^n}(p^{(k+1)n}) - p^n Z_{p^n}(p^{kn}) &= \frac{Z_p(p^{(k+1)n}) - r}{n} - p^n \frac{Z_p(p^{kn}) - s}{n} \leq \frac{Z_p(p^{(k+1)n}) - r}{n} - \frac{Z_p(p^{kn}) + p^n s}{n} = \\ &= \frac{\frac{p^n-1}{p-1} + p^n s}{n} - \frac{p^n + p^n s}{n} \leq \\ &\leq \frac{p^n + p^n(n-1)}{n} = p^n. \end{aligned}$$

□

2.2. The base p^n expansion of $\vartheta(p^n)$. Let us start by introducing some notation.

With $q = \{d.d_1 d_2 \dots d_t \overbrace{d_{t+1} \dots d_{t+s}}\}_b$ we mean that the fractional part of q in base b consists of t digits followed by a periodic sequence of s digits ($d_{t+i} = d_{t+i+s}$ for all $i > 0$). Clearly t can be arbitrarily large and the length of the period can be any multiple of s , so we will usually assume that t and s are minimal. We will say that q is exact in base b if there exists $k \geq 1$ such that $d_i = 0$ for every $i \geq k$ or $d_i = b-1$ for every $i \geq k$; i.e.:

$$q = \{d.d_1 d_2 \dots d_t \overbrace{b-1}\}_b = \{d.d_1 d_2 \dots d_t + 1 \overbrace{0}\}_b$$

Lemma 3. Let p be a prime and $1 \leq r \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $\frac{1}{r(p-1)}$ is exact in base p^r if and only if $p = 2$ and r is a power of 2.

Proof. This is a straightforward consequence from the fact that $\frac{1}{n}$ is exact in base p^r if and only if $\text{rad}(n) = p$; i. e., if and only if n is a power of p . □

Now we will present some results about the base b expansion of $\vartheta(b)$ when $b = p^n$ is a prime-power.

Lemma 4. *Let p be a prime and $b = p^n$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then:*

$$\vartheta(p^n) = \{0.d_1d_2\dots d_t \overbrace{d_{t+1}\dots d_{t+s}}\}_b \iff \frac{p^{nt}}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{sn-1} p^i \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Proof. First of all observe that:

$$\frac{p^{nt}}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{sn-1} p^i = \frac{p^{nt}(p^{sn} - 1)}{n(p - 1)} = b^t \vartheta(p^n)(b^s - 1).$$

Let us suppose that $\vartheta(p^n) = \{0.d_1d_2\dots d_t \overbrace{d_{t+1}\dots d_{t+s}}\}_b$. Then we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} b^t \vartheta(p^n) &= \{d_1d_2\dots d_t \overbrace{d_{t+1}\dots d_{t+s}}\}_b, \\ b^{t+s} \vartheta(p^n) &= \{d_1d_2\dots d_t d_{t+1}\dots d_{t+s} \overbrace{d_{t+1}\dots d_{t+s}}\}_b. \end{aligned}$$

and it is enough to subtract both expressions to obtain that $b^t \vartheta(p^n)(b^s - 1) \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Conversely, assume that $b^t \vartheta(p^n)(b^s - 1) \in \mathbb{Z}$. It is easy to see that there exists a sequence $\{d_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{N}$, not eventually null, such that:

$$\vartheta(p^n) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} d_i p^{-ni} \text{ with } 0 \leq d_i < b, \forall i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Consequently:

$$\begin{aligned} b^t \vartheta(p^n) &= z_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} d_{t+i} p^{-ni} \text{ with } z_1 \in \mathbb{Z}, \\ b^{(t+s)} \vartheta(p^n) &= z_2 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} d_{t+s+i} p^{-ni} \text{ with } z_2 \in \mathbb{Z}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} d_{t+i} p^{-ni} \leq 1, \\ 0 &< \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} d_{t+s+i} p^{-ni} \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since $b^{(t+s)} \vartheta(p^n) - b^t \vartheta(p^n) = b^t \vartheta(p^n)(b^s - 1) \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have that:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} d_{t+s+i} p^{-ni} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} d_{t+i} p^{-ni}.$$

From this fact it readily follows that $d_{t+i} = d_{t+s+i}$ and the proof is complete. $\square$

Proposition 2. *Let p be a prime, $b = p^n$ and $(n, s, k) \in \mathbb{N}^3$. Then:*

$$\frac{b^k}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{sn-1} p^i \in \mathbb{Z} \iff \frac{b}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{sn-1} p^i \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Or, in other words:

$$\frac{p^{nk}(p^{sn} - 1)}{n(p - 1)} \in \mathbb{Z} \iff \frac{p^n(p^{sn} - 1)}{n(p - 1)} \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Proof. We can write $n = p^r n'$ with $r \geq 0$ and $\gcd(p, n') = 1$. Then $b^k = p^{kn} = p^{p^r n' k}$ and observe that $r < p^r < p^r n' < p^r n' k$.

Assume that $\frac{b^k}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{sn-1} p^i \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $\frac{p^{p^r n' k - r}}{n'} \sum_{i=0}^{sn-1} p^i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and, since $\gcd(p, n') = 1$ it follows that $\frac{1}{n'} \sum_{i=0}^{sn-1} p^i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\frac{p^{p^r n' - r}}{n'} \sum_{i=0}^{sn-1} p^i \in \mathbb{Z}$. But $\frac{p^{p^r n' - r}}{n'} = \frac{b}{n}$ and we are done.

The converse is obvious. $\square$

Corollary 2. *The base p^n expansion of $\vartheta(p^n)$ is pure periodic or mixed periodic with only one non-periodic figure; i. e., either $\vartheta(p^n) = \{0.d_1 \overbrace{d_2 \dots d_{s+1}}\}_{p^n}$ with $d_{s+1} \neq d_1$ or $\vartheta(p^n) = \{0.\overbrace{d_1 \dots d_s}\}_{p^n}$*

Proof. If $\vartheta(p^n) = \{0.d_1 d_2 \dots d_t \overbrace{d_{t+1} \dots d_{t+s}}\}_{p^n}$, then we have that $\frac{p^{nt}}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{sn-1} p^i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

By the previous proposition this implies that $\frac{p^n}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{sn-1} p^i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and, consequently,

$\vartheta(p^n) = \{0.d_1 \overbrace{d_2 \dots d_{s+1}}\}_{p^n}$. Finally, if $d_{s+1} = d_1$, then $\vartheta(p^n)$ is pure periodic and this completes the proof. $\square$

2.3. The main lemma. The following lemma will be crucial in the next section.

Lemma 5. *Let $\{S_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of integers and define $\Delta_1 := S_1$ and $\Delta_n := S_{n+1} - bS_n$. If $0 < \Delta_n < b$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then the following hold:*

- (1) $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n b^{n-i} \Delta_i$.
- (2) $\lfloor \log_b S_n \rfloor + 1 = n$.
- (3) $\ell := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S_n}{b^n} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b^{-i} \Delta_i$.
- (4) If $\Delta_i = (b-1)$ for all $i > 1$, then $S_k = \ell b^k - 1$ for every $k > 1$.
- (5) If ℓ is not exact in base b , then $S_k = \lfloor \ell b^k \rfloor$ for every k .
- (6) If $\ell = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b^{-i} \Delta_i \in \mathbb{Q}$, then there exists $(t, s) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ with $s > 0$ such that $\Delta_{n+s} = \Delta_n$ (and $S_{n+s} = S_n$) for all $n > t$.

Proof. (1) It follows from inductive arguments, since $S_1 = \Delta_1$.

(2) Consequence of (1).

(3) Observe that $\frac{S_n}{b^n} = \sum_{i=1}^n b^{-i} \Delta_i$ and take limits.

(4) We must consider two cases.

If $\Delta_1 < (b-1)$, then $\ell = \frac{(\Delta_1 + 1)}{b}$, $\ell b^k - 1 = (\Delta_1 + 1)b^{k-1} - 1$ and also:

$$S_k = \sum_{i=1}^k b^{k-i} \Delta_i = \Delta_1 b^{k-1} + \sum_{i=2}^k b^{k-i} (b-1) = \Delta_1 b^{k-1} + b^{k-1} - 1.$$

Now, if $\Delta_1 = b - 1$, then $\ell = 1$ and:

$$S_k = \sum_{i=1}^k b^{k-i}(b-1) = \sum_{i=1}^k b^{k+1-i} - \sum_{i=1}^k b^{k-i} = b^k - 1.$$

(5) Observe that

$$\ell b^k = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b^{k-i} \Delta_i = \sum_{i=1}^k b^{k-i} \Delta_i + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b^{-i} \Delta_{i+k}.$$

Now, if ℓ is not exact, it follows that $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b^{-i} \Delta_{i+k} < 1$ and consequently:

$$\lfloor \ell b^k \rfloor = \left\lfloor \sum_{i=1}^k b^{k-i} \Delta_i + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b^{-i} \Delta_{i+k} \right\rfloor = \sum_{i=1}^k b^{k-i} \Delta_i = S_k.$$

(6) It is clear since the base b expansion of any rational number is periodic. $\square$

3. THE PRIME POWER CASE

The next theorem establishes the equality between the digits of the base b expansion of $Z_b(b^k)$ and the first k digits of the base b expansion of $\vartheta(b)$ if b is a prime power. In passing we will also prove some other interesting properties.

Theorem 1. *Let p be a prime and $b = p^n$. Consider the sequence $a_1 = Z_b(b)$, $a_k := Z_b(b^{k+1}) - bZ_b(b^k)$ and let s be the smallest integer such that $\theta := \frac{b}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{sn-1} p^i \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Then, the following hold:

- (1) $Z_b(b^k) = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i b^{k-i}$.
- (2) $\vartheta(b) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Z_b(b^n)}{b^n} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b^{-i} a_i$.
- (3) *The base b expansion of $\vartheta(b)$ is:*

$$\vartheta(b) = \begin{cases} \{0.a_1 \overbrace{a_2 \cdots a_{s+1}}\}_b & \text{if } \frac{\theta}{b} \notin \mathbb{Z}. \\ \{0.\overbrace{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_s}\}_b & \text{if } \frac{\theta}{b} \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{cases}$$

- (4) $a_k = a_{k+s}$ for all $k > 1$. Moreover, if $\frac{\theta}{b} \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $a_k = a_{k+s}$ for all $k > 0$.

(5)

$$\#\{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = \begin{cases} s, & \text{if } \frac{\theta}{b} \in \mathbb{Z}. \\ s+1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- (6) If $\frac{\theta}{b} \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $Z_b(b^s) = \frac{\theta}{b}$. Otherwise, $Z_b(b^{s+1}) = \theta + Z_b(b)$.

- (7) If $b+1$ is not a Fermat number, then $Z_b(b^k) = \lfloor b^k \vartheta(b) \rfloor$.

- (8) If $b+1$ is a Fermat number, then $Z_b(b^k) = b^k \vartheta(b) - 1$.

Proof. First of all observe that, due to Corollary 2, there exists an integer s such that $\theta = \frac{b}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{sn-1} p^i \in \mathbb{Z}$ or, equivalently, such that $\vartheta(p^n) = \{0.\overbrace{d_1 d_2 \dots d_{s+1}}\}_b$. Moreover, if $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{sn-1} p^i \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $\vartheta(p^n) = \{0.\overbrace{d_1 \dots d_s}\}_b$. Also, by Lemma 2, we have that $0 < a_k < b$ so we are in the conditions of Lemma 5.

After these considerations we can proceed to the proof of the theorem.

- (1) Apply Lemma 5 (1).
- (2) Apply Lemma 5 (3).
- (3) Due to Corollary 2.
- (4) Idem.
- (5) Obvious by the minimality of s .
- (6) If $\frac{\theta}{b} \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{sn-1} p^i = \frac{\theta}{b} \in \mathbb{Z}$. This implies that $\vartheta(b) = \{0.\overbrace{a_1 a_2 \dots a_s}\}_b$, so $b^s \vartheta(b) = \{a_1 a_2 \dots a_s.\overbrace{a_1 a_2 \dots a_s}\}_b$ and, consequently,

$$\frac{\theta}{b} = \vartheta(b)(b^s - 1) = \sum_{i=1}^s a_i b^{k-i} = Z_b(b^s).$$

Now, if $\frac{\theta}{b} \notin \mathbb{Z}$ then $\frac{b}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{sn-1} p^i = \theta \in \mathbb{Z}$ so $\vartheta(b) = \{0.a_1 \overbrace{a_2 a_3 \dots a_{s+1}}\}_b$ and it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} b^{s+1} \vartheta(b) &= \{a_1 a_2 \dots a_{s+1}.\overbrace{a_2 a_3 \dots a_{s+1}}\}_b, \\ b \vartheta(b) &= \{a_1.\overbrace{a_2 a_3 \dots a_{s+1}}\}_b. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\theta = \frac{b}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{sn-1} p^i = b \vartheta(b)(b^s - 1) = \sum_{i=1}^{s+1} a_i b^{k-i} - a_1 = Z_b(b^{s+1}) - Z_b(b).$$

- (7) If $p^n + 1$ is not a Fermat number, then $\vartheta(p^n)$ is not exact due to Lemma 4. Then, it is enough to apply Lemma 5 (5).
- (8) If $p^n + 1$ is a Fermat number; then $p = 2$ and n is a power of 2. In this case $\vartheta(p^n)$ is exact and Lemma 5 (4) applies.

□

Let us recall that a base- b repunit with k digits, $R_k^{(b)}$, is an integer whose base b expansion consists exactly of k ones; i. e.:

$$R_k^{(b)} := \{1, 1, \dots, 1\}_b = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} b^i = \frac{b^k - 1}{b - 1}.$$

In the same way, a base- b repdigit with k digits is a multiple of a base- b repunit with k digits, i. e., an integer of the form $\alpha R_k^{(b)} = \{\alpha, \alpha, \dots, \alpha\}_b$ with $1 \leq \alpha \leq b-1$.

Proposition 3. *Let p be a prime. If $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p^i = \frac{R_n^{(p)}}{n} \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $Z_{p^n}(p^{nk})$ is a base- p^n repdigit with k digits for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Namely:*

$$Z_{p^n}(p^{nk}) = \frac{R_n^{(p)} R_k^{(p^n)}}{n}.$$

Proof. Theorem 1 implies that $\vartheta(p^n) = \{0. \widehat{a_1}\}_{p^n}$, where $a_1 = \frac{R_n^{(p)}}{n}$. Consequently,

$$Z_{p^n}(p^{nk}) = \{a_1, a_1, \dots, a_1\}_{p^n} = \frac{R_n^{(p)}}{n} R_k^{(p^n)}.$$

□

It is interesting to particularize the previous result for $n = 1, 2$.

Corollary 3. *Let p be a prime, then $Z_p(p^k)$ is a base- p repunit with k digits for every integer k .*

Proof. Follows immediately from the previous proposition, since $\frac{R_1^{(p)}}{1} = 1 \in \mathbb{Z}$. □

Corollary 4. *Let p be an odd prime, then $Z_{p^2}(p^{2k})$ is a base- p^2 repdigit.*

Proof. If p is odd, then $\frac{R_2^{(p)}}{2} = \frac{p+1}{2} \in \mathbb{Z}$. □

If p is odd, the above corollary can be generalized for any power of 2. Namely, we have the following.

Proposition 4. *If p is an odd prime, then $Z_{p^{2^m}}(p^{2^m k})$ is a base- p^{2^m} repdigit.*

Proof. $\frac{R_{2^m}^{(p)}}{2^m} = \frac{1}{2^m} \prod_{i=0}^{m-1} (1 + p^{2^i}) \in \mathbb{Z}$. □

Remark. We have seen that $\vartheta(p) = \{0. \widehat{1}\}_p$ for every prime p . Nevertheless, the set of pairs $(b_1, b_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that the base b_1 expansion of $\vartheta(b_1)$ and the base b_2 expansion of $\vartheta(b_2)$ coincide seems to be very small. In fact for $b_i \leq 40000$ there are only two such couples. Namely:

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta(81) &= \{0. \widehat{10}\}_{81} \text{ and } \vartheta(361) = \{0. \widehat{10}\}_{361}. \\ \vartheta(343) &= \{0. \widehat{19}\}_{343} \text{ and } \vartheta(1369) = \{0. \widehat{19}\}_{1369}. \end{aligned}$$

4. THE GENERAL CASE

If b is not a prime power, there is no equality between the k digits of $Z_b(b^k)$ and the first k digits of the base b expansion of $\vartheta(b)$. As a consequence, $Z_b(b^k)$ presents certain anomalies in its final digits. For instance:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{10}(10^9) &= 249999998, \\ Z_{10}(10^{99}) &= 249999999 \dots 99999980, \\ Z_{10}(10^{999}) &= 249999999 \dots 99999791, \\ Z_{10}(10^{9999}) &= 249999999 \dots 999997859. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Z_6(6^5) &= \{2, 5, 5, 5, 5, \mathbf{4}\}_6, \\ Z_6(6^{6^2-1}) &= \{2, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, \dots, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, \mathbf{4}, \mathbf{1}\}_6, \\ Z_6(6^{6^3-1}) &= \{2, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, \dots, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, \mathbf{4}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{5}\}_6, \\ Z_6(6^{6^4-1}) &= \{2, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, \dots, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, \mathbf{4}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{3}, \mathbf{4}\}_6, \\ Z_6(6^{6^5-1}) &= \{2, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, \dots, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, \mathbf{4}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{3}, \mathbf{3}, \mathbf{4}\}_6. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 5. *The sequence $\{\gamma_k\}_{k \geq 1} := \left\{ \frac{Z_b(b^k)}{b^k} \right\}_{k \geq 1}$ is strictly increasing. As a consequence, $\frac{Z_b(b^k)}{b^k} < \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Z_b(n)}{n}$ for every $k > 0$.*

Proposition 6. *The number of digits of the base b expansion of $Z_b(b^k)$ is exactly k ; i. e.:*

Proof. By Lemma 2 (1), we know that $bZ_b(b^k) < Z_b(b^{(k+1)})$. Taking logarithms we have $1 + \log_b Z_b(b^k) < \log_b Z_b(b^{(k+1)})$, which clearly implies that $\lfloor \log_b Z_b(b^k) \rfloor < \lfloor \log_b Z_b(b^{(k+1)}) \rfloor$.

Let us see now that the equality holds. Assume, on the contrary, that $1 + \lfloor \log_b Z_b(b^{k_0}) \rfloor > k_0$ for certain k_0 . Then $1 + \lfloor \log_b Z_b(b^m) \rfloor > m$ for every $m \geq k_0$. This clearly implies that $\frac{Z_b(b^m)}{b^m} > 1$ for every $m > k_0$ and $\vartheta(b) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Z_b(b^m)}{b^m} \geq 1$, which is clearly a contradiction since by definition $\vartheta(b) \leq 1$, the equality only holds for $b = 2$ and $\frac{Z_2(2^m)}{2^m} = \frac{2^m - 1}{2^m} < 1$. $\square$

To do so, let us introduce some notation:

$$\eta(b, k) = \lfloor \log_b \alpha(b, k) + 1 \rfloor.$$

Observe that the number of different digits that we are studying is, at most, $\eta(b, k) + 1$. Now we can give an upper bound for $\eta(b, k)$.

Theorem 2. *The number of digits of the base b expansion of $\alpha(b, k)$ is smaller or equal than the number of digits of the base b expansion of k , plus 1; i. e.:*

$$\eta(b, k) \leq \lfloor \log_b k + 2 \rfloor.$$

Proof. If $k = 1$, then $\lfloor \vartheta(b)b \rfloor - Z_b(b) \leq b$, since $\vartheta(b) \leq 1$ and $Z_b(b) \geq 0$. This implies that $\eta(b, 1) = \lfloor \log_b (\lfloor \vartheta(b)b \rfloor - Z_b(b)) + 1 \rfloor \leq \lfloor \log_b b + 1 \rfloor = 2 = \lfloor \log_b k + 2 \rfloor$, as claimed.

Now, let $k \geq 2$. Put $b = p_1^{r_1} \cdots p_s^{r_s}$ and assume, without loss of generality, that p_1 is such that $\min_{1 \leq i \leq s} \frac{1}{r_i(p_i - 1)} = \frac{1}{r_1(p_1 - 1)}$. In that case $Z_b(b^k) = \left\lfloor \frac{b^k - \sigma_{p_1}(b^k)}{r_1(p_1 - 1)} \right\rfloor$ and $\vartheta(b) = \frac{1}{r_1(p_1 - 1)}$. Also observe that if $\beta = \frac{b}{p_1}$, then $\sigma_{p_1}(b^k) = \sigma_{p_1}(\beta^k)$. Now:

$$\begin{aligned} \lfloor \vartheta(b)b^k \rfloor - Z_b(b^k) &= \lfloor \vartheta(b)b^k \rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{b^k - \sigma_{p_1}(b^k)}{r_1(p_1 - 1)} \right\rfloor \leq \frac{b^k - (b^k - \sigma_{p_1}(b^k))}{r_1(p_1 - 1)} + 1 = \\ &= 1 + \frac{\sigma_{p_1}(\beta^k)}{r_1(p_1 - 1)} \leq 1 + \frac{(p_1 - 1)(1 + \lfloor \log_{p_1} \beta^k \rfloor)}{r_1(p_1 - 1)} = \\ &= 1 + \frac{1 + \lfloor \log_{p_1} \beta^k \rfloor}{r_1} \leq 2 + \lfloor \log_{p_1} \beta^k \rfloor = \lfloor \log_{p_1} p_1^2 \beta^k \rfloor \leq \\ &\leq \lfloor \log_{p_1} b^k \rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently $\eta(b, k) = \lfloor \log_b (\lfloor \vartheta(b)b^k \rfloor - Z_b(b^k)) + 1 \rfloor \leq \lfloor \log_b (\lfloor \log_{p_1} b^k \rfloor) \rfloor + 1 \leq \lfloor \log_b (k \log_{p_1} b) \rfloor + 1 = \lfloor \log_b k + \log_b \log_{p_1} b \rfloor + 1 \leq \lfloor \log_b k \rfloor + 2 = \lfloor \log_b k + 2 \rfloor$. $\square$

Remark. The bound obtained in the previous theorem is the best possible one. In fact, there exists values of the pair (b, k) such that $\eta(b, k) = \lfloor \log_b k + 2 \rfloor$. Namely, if $k = b - 1$ and $b < 1000$ the following values:

$b = 120, 180, 240, 336, 360, 378, 420, 448, 504, 560, 630, 672, 720, 756, 840, 945$ satisfy that $\eta(b, b - 1) = 2 = \lfloor \log_b (b - 1) + 2 \rfloor$.

Corollary 5. *The number of unequal digits between $Z_b(b^k)$ and the first k digits of the base b expansion of $\vartheta(b)$ is smaller or equal than the number of digits of k plus 2.*

Proof. The number of unequal digits is, at most, $\eta(b, k) + 1$ which, by the previous theorem, is smaller or equal than $(\lfloor \log_b k \rfloor + 1) + 2$. $\square$

Remark. It is interesting to observe that, as far as the authors have been able to test computationally, the inequality given in the preceding corollary is strict. Nevertheless we have not found a proof for this fact, so it remains a conjecture.

Conjecture 1. *The number of unequal digits between $Z_b(b^k)$ and the first k digits of the base b expansion of $\vartheta(b)$ is smaller or equal than the number of digits of k plus 1.*

If b is square-free, we can improve the bound given in Theorem 2.

Proposition 7. *Let $b = p_1 \cdots p_s$ be a square-free integer ($s \geq 2$). Then $\vartheta(b)b^k - Z_b(b^k) \leq k(s - 1)$ for every k . As a consequence $\eta(b, k) \leq \lfloor \log_b k + \log_b (s - 1) + 1 \rfloor \leq \lfloor \log_b k + 1.21 \rfloor$.*

Proof. We can suppose, without loss of generality, that p_1 is the greatest prime in the decomposition of b . Then $\vartheta(b)b^k = \frac{b^k}{p_1 - 1}$ and also $Z_b(b^k) = Z_{p_1}(b^k)$.

On the other hand, $(p_2 \cdots p_s)^k < p_1^{k(s-1)}$, so we can find $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{k(s-1)-1}$ integers smaller than p_1 such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k(s-1)-1} (\epsilon_i - 1)p_1^i \leq (p_2 \cdots p_s)^k < \epsilon_1 p_1 + \sum_{i=2}^{k(s-1)-1} (\epsilon_i - 1)p_1^i.$$

As a consequence $Z_{p_1}(p_2^k \cdots p_s^k) = \sum_{i=1}^{k(s-1)-1} (\epsilon_i - 1) \frac{p_1^i - 1}{p_1 - 1}$ and recall that, by Corollary 1, $Z_{p_1}(b^k) = (p_2 \cdots p_s)^k Z_{p_1}(p_1^k) + Z_{p_1}(p_2^k \cdots p_s^k)$.

Finally, putting all together:

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta(b)b^k - Z_b(b^k) &= \frac{p_2^k \cdots p_s^k - \sum_{i=1}^{k(s-1)-1} (\epsilon_i - 1)(p_1^i - 1)}{p_1 - 1} \leq \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon_1 p_1 + \sum_{i=2}^{k(s-1)-1} \epsilon_i p_1^i - 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k(s-1)-1} (\epsilon_i - 1)(p_1^i - 1)}{p_1 - 1} = \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k(s-1)-1} (\epsilon_i - 1) + (p_1 - 1)}{p_1 - 1} \leq k(s-1). \end{aligned}$$

To end the proof it is enough to recall the definition of $\eta(b, k)$ and to observe that $\log_b(s-1) < 0.21$. $\square$

Remark. The previous proposition can be refined in some special cases. For instance:

- (1) If b is the product of 2 distinct primes; i.e., if $s = 2$ is the proposition, then $\eta(b, k) \leq \lfloor \log_b k + 1 \rfloor$.
- (2) If b is square-free and k is a power of b , then:

$$\eta(b, k) = \eta(b, b^m) \leq \lfloor m + 1.21 \rfloor = m + 1 = \lfloor \log_b k + 1 \rfloor.$$

This remark motivates this final conjecture, which remains open, that closes the paper.

Conjecture 2. *If b is a square-free integer, then $\eta(b, k) \leq \lfloor \log_b k + 1 \rfloor$.*

REFERENCES

- [1] Harriet Griffin. *Elementary theory of numbers*. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York-Toronto-London, 1954.
- [2] Hansraj Gupta. *Selected topics in number theory*. Abacus Press, Tunbridge Wells, 1980.
- [3] David S. Hart, James E. Marengo, Darren A. Narayan, and David S. Ross. On the number of trailing zeros in $n!$ *College Math. J.*, 39(2):139–145, 2008.
- [4] A.M. Legendre. *Essai sur la theorie des nombres*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2009.
- [5] Ivan Niven, Herbert S. Zuckerman, and Hugh L. Montgomery. *An introduction to the theory of numbers*. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, fifth edition, 1991.

- [6] A.M. Oller-Marcén. A new look at the trailing zeroes of $n!$. *arXiv:0906.4868v1 [math.NT]*.
- [7] B. Schmuland. Shouting factorials. *Pi in the sky*, 7:10–12, 2003.
- [8] M.L. Treuden. Frequencies of digits in factorials: an experimental approach. *College Math. J.*, 25(1):48–55, 1994.